

Appendix A. Verification Process to Identify Uncertainties

Where, no up-to-date, reliable systematic reviews or guidelines of research evidence addressing the uncertainty exist/have not been adequately addressed. If a study protocol exists, this will be noted. These uncertainties will move forward for interim prioritization.

Process	Description	Output
a. Check evidence-base for relevant, up to date systematic reviews, guidelines and study protocols (i.e., studies in process)	<div><div>i. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (EBM Reviews)</div><div>ii. American College of Physicians (ACP) Journal Club via Medline (Ovid)</div><div>iii. Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE) via Medline (Ovid)</div><div>iv. Medline databases (Ovid)</div><div>v. Canadian Respiratory Guidelines (Canadian Thoracic Society)</div><div>vi. Global Initiative for Asthma (GINA)</div><div>vii. AAFP (USA)</div><div>viii. NICE guidelines (UK)</div><div>ix. Other (used if unique population, intervention or outcome would be better addressed in a different database)</div></div>	If evidence is available, cite it with primary author conclusion.
	Using specific search terms as they relate to the submission topic area, subtopic area and outcome (as identified). Specific search outputs will be documented as they relate to each topic and subtopic area.	
	To check questions about sleep and breathing risk factors, which are mainly addressed by reviews including prospective cohort studies, other systematic reviews. MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL and PsycINFO will be searched with the same keywords using a systematic review filter.	
b. Determine if evidence is reliable and relevant using	1] Systematic review	
	1.1 Has it been published in the last 3 years?	[YES > does not move forward; NO > moves forward]

Process	Description	Output
the following criteria:	AND 1.2 For evidence not derived from Cochrane et al., ask the following: Does it have published clear methods? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where inclusion/exclusion criteria reported? • Was search adequate? • Where the included studies synthesized? • Was the quality of included studies assessed? • Are sufficient details about the individual included studies presented? • Was any potential bias addressed/managed? 	[YES > does not move forward; NO > moves forward]
	AND 1.3 Are reported findings clinically significant?	[YES > does not move forward; NO > moves forward]
	2] Guidelines	
	2.1 Are guidelines evidence-based, that are used as a framework for clinical decision making and supporting best practices from authoritative Canadian, American or UK bodies?	[YES > does not move forward; NO > moves forward]
	3] Protocol	
	3.1 If no systematic review or guidelines have been located, conduct Protocol search through EBM Cochrane	[YES > note its existence; NO > moves forward]
		If all of the criteria have been answered with a Yes = "Known unknown" [tier 2] If one or more of the criteria has been answered with a No = Uncertainty

Process	Description	Output
c. Verify selection output	Clinical significance must be determined by Steering Committee based on reported findings and recorded author conclusions.	Long-list of uncertainties are identified for interim prioritization (and 'known unknowns' are recorded with evidence cited)